

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PATRICK JURDON,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
vs.

Case No.: 1:23-cv-01695-KES-SKO

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE STIPULATION FOR ENTRY  
OF PROTECTIVE ORDER RE:  
CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS**

CITY OF HANFORD; CITY OF HANFORD  
POLICE DEPARTMENT; PARKER SEVER, in  
his individual and official capacity; GABRIEL  
JIMENEZ, in his individual capacity; JAMES  
LUTZ, in his individual capacity; KARL  
ANDERSON, in his individual capacity; JAMES  
EDLUND, in his individual capacity; and Does 1  
through 50, inclusive,  
Defendants.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

On May 21, 2024, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their Stipulation and Protective Order. (Doc. 22). The Court has reviewed the proposed stipulated protective order and has determined that, in its current form, it cannot be granted. For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES without prejudice the parties' request to approve the stipulated protective order.

**II. DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(c), any proposed protective order submitted by the parties must contain the following provisions:

- (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child);
- (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and

- 1 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a  
2 court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the  
3 parties.

4 Local Rule 141.1(c).

5 The parties' order, in its current form, does not satisfy Rule 141. The proposed protective  
6 order does not provide a description of the type of information eligible for protection in a way  
7 that is sufficient to reveal the nature of the information. (*See, e.g.*, Doc. 22 at 2 (defining  
8 confidential information as "information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained)  
9 or tangible things in the possession of a Designating Party who believe in good faith that such  
10 information qualifies for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).") At most,  
11 the proposed protective order "extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled  
12 to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles," though it is unclear what kind of  
13 information the parties' are seeking to protect. The parties also fail to identify a "particularized  
14 need for protection," and why that "the need for protection should be addressed by a court order,  
15 as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties." Without this information, the  
16 Court cannot grant the parties' stipulation (Doc. 22), and it will be denied without prejudice. The  
17 parties may re-file a revised proposed stipulated protective order that complies with Local Rule  
18 141.1(c) and corrects the deficiencies set forth in this order.

19  
20 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

21 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' request for approval  
22 of their stipulated protective order (Doc. 22) is DENIED without prejudice subject to renewal of  
23 the request.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25  
26 Dated: May 23, 2024

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE